

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-10 are objected to because the elements “a rotational drive” (claim 1, line 7) and “a rotor” (claim 1 line 9) are inferentially recited. Additionally, there is no proper antecedence basis for “the rotational drive” (claim 1 line 9, claims 3 and 4, line 2).

To the extent the claims are positively recited the structure, it appears that the following prior art rejection is proper.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1,3,4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Munz (US 6,561,096) in view of Vestman et al. (EP 909,648).

With respect to claims 1 and 4, Munz teaches a cleaning device 1 having a guide rail 3 which is arranged parallel to a printing cylinder 2 for moving a washing device 5 in a longitudinal direction. The washing device includes a brush 6 that is driven by an integrated rotational drive in the brush (Munz, Figs. 1-4 and col.7 lines 58-63). Munz does not clearly show a rotational drive allocated to a cleaning brush. Vestman et al. shows the conventional

rotational drive 5 allocated to the cleaning brush 4 as shown in Fig.3 of Vestman et al. In view of the teaching of Vestman et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cleaning device of Munz by providing the rotational drive which is integrated into a cleaning brush as taught by Vestman et al. for manufacturing of a more compact cleaning device if in fact Munz does not teach the rotation drive allocated and integrated to a cleaning brush. With respect to claim 3, the use of an electric drive is well known in the art, and the integrated rotational drive of Munz is inherently an electric drive since the washing device is provided an electrical flug-in fittings (Munz, col.7 line 19 and claim 1, line 36). With respect to claim 6, the use of a rotor of an integrated rotational drive which is formed of a body which is locked on a rotationally driven shaft and displaceable or movable in a longitudinal direction is conventional as exemplified by Figs. 2 and 3 Munz. With respect to claims 7-10, the structure of the guide rail and washing device is the same regardless of material and the process of making the guide and the washing.

*Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

The patents to Mayer et al. and Switall et al. are cited to show other structures having obvious similarities to the claimed structure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Art Unit: 2854

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169. The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen, can be reached on (571) 272-2258.

The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

/Anthony H Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2854